

PATENT

Any. Dkt. No. MRKS/0133

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 16, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 16, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-7 are rejected. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled by the Applicant and new claims 8-25 have been added.

IDS

The Information Disclosure Statement sent on March 18, 2004, included a Foreign Patent Document GB 2,312,074. The number associated with the Document is incorrect. The appropriate number is GB 2,321,074 by the same inventor. Further, the Examiner has cited this reference against the Applicant. The Examiner, however, refers to the Patent Document as 231,074 which is also incorrect. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner update the Notice of References Cited in order to include the proper Patent document GB 2,321,074.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Ezell, et al.* (GB 231074) (see figure 2B; page 9, lines 8-15 and page 12, lines 3-15). Claims 1-7 have been cancelled by Applicant.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Head* (U.S. 5,709, 269) (e.g., figures 8-11 and column 5, line 44 through column 6, line 21). Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 have been cancelled by Applicant.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Watson, et al.* (U.S. 5,398,763). Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 have been cancelled by Applicant.

PATENT

Att. Dkt. No. MRKS/0133

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Head '269* or *Watson, et al. '763* in view of *Ezell, et al. '074* or *Robison, et al. (U.S. 6,755,249)*. Claim 3 has been cancelled by Applicant.

New Claims

New claims 8-23 have been added to better define aspects of the invention. No new matter has been added. Regarding claim 8, the references cited by the Examiner neither alone nor in combination disclose a lock, a lock retainer, a biasing member for biasing the lock retainer to release the lock, and a dissolvable member retaining the lock retainer to maintain the lock in a locked position as recited in the base claim and claims 9-19 that depend therefrom. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 8-19 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 20, the references cited by the Examiner neither alone nor in combination teach, show, or suggest running a tool into a wellbore, wherein the tool is coupled to the tubular string by a lock, a lock retainer, a biasing member for biasing the lock retainer to release the lock, and a dissolvable member retaining the lock retainer to maintain the lock in a locked position as recited in the base claim and claims 21-25 which depend therefrom. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 8-25 are in condition for allowance.


PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. MRKS0133

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed. In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant